

Response dated July 9, 2010

Response to Restriction Requirement of June 9, 2010

A restriction requirement is proper when (1) the inventions are independent or distinct as claimed; and (2) there is a serious burden on the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the examination of claims 67 and 133 together would not pose a serious burden on the Examiner. A search of the prior art of claim 67 would also necessarily encompass a search of the prior art for claim 133.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

II. Provisional Election of Species

Applicants provisionally elect the species of independent claim 67 and dependent claims 68-77, 81-84, and 89-93, with traverse.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 9, 2010

/Jamie T. Wisz/
Jamie T. Wisz
Registration No.: 58,429
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 663-6000 (telephone)
(202) 663-6363(facsimile)